



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,645	01/10/2001	Jeffrey Allen Hamilton	37304-0200	9524

7590 11/29/2001
Lee G. Meyer
Snell & Wilmer, LLP
Suite 1950
1200 17th Street
Denver, CO 80202

EXAMINER

TANG, SON M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2632

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/758,645

Applicant(s)

Jefrey Allen Hamilton

Examiner

Son M Tang

Art Unit

2632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2632

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Drawing of Fig. 1 needs label all the box components .

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-5, 31, 36-37, 42, 46 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Kikinis** [U.S. Pat. 5,815,093].

As to claim 1: **Kikinis** discloses a remote information downloading device for wireless access to and downloading of vehicle information from a remote, on-board, vehicle incident recording system, which comprising an interface communicating with and accessing and receiving incident data from the vehicle incident recording system (as cited in col. 6, lines 13-16) and a transceiver (75) coupled to said information datalink for accessing, receiving, downloading,

Art Unit: 2632

and transmitting said vehicle information from the vehicle incident recording system (as shown in Fig. 1 and col. 5, lines 54-67 and col. 6, lines 1-17).

As to claims 2-5, 31: Kikinis further discloses an information storage device coupled to said vehicle incident recording system for capturing and storing said vehicle information into a CD ROM drive for history record (as shown in Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 31-45 and col. 4, lines 5-12).

As to claim 36: Refer to claim 1 above.

As to claims 37, 42, 46, 48-50: Refer to claims 2-5 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims **6-21, 22-30, 32-35, 38-41, 43-45 and 50-52** are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kikinis** [U.S. Pat. 5,815,093] in view of **Shamosh et al.** [U.S. Pat. 5,144,661].

As to claims 6-16: **Kikinis** disclose all the limitation as describe above, Kikinis silence to disclose wherein the vehicle information comprises video information, and display screen and audio information, Shamosh et al. teach a security protection system and method which comprises a video/audio recording unit (24) which could be display at the remote site as well (as shown in

Art Unit: 2632

Fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 60-68). It would have been obvious of one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have a video/audio display as taught by Shamosh et al. into the system disclosed by Kikinus in order to increase the safety, since video camera records a dynamic and precisely incident information of a vehicle.

As to claims 17-21, 25-30, 50 and 43-45: The claimed "interface is a transceiver which includes a download trigger and a download trigger is adapted to respond to transmitted instructions, access code and a predetermined event. It is obvious, since any conventional computer is having an interface which uses for transmitting and receiving information, and requires access code to operate.

As to claims 22-24: Shamosh et al. further disclose an encrypt (36) and decrypt (41) which use to convert information and information storage device is remotely located from said vehicle which met by a computer (46) (as shown in Fig. 1-2 and col. 4, lines 20-47).

As to claims 32-35: Shamosh et al. further disclose wherein said device is adapted for use in a stationary facility, consisting of a police station (as cited in col. 6, lines 43-45), and wherein said device is adapted for use in any well-known vehicle is an intention used.

As to claims 38-41: Refer to claims 6-16 above.

As to claims 51-52: Refer to claims 22-24 above.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2632

--- **Reid** [U.S. Pat. 5,027,104] disclose a Vehicle Security Device.
--- **Swanson et al.** [U.S. Pat. 5,689,442] disclose an Event Surveillance System.
--- **Hackett et al.** [U.S. Pat. 5,926,210] disclose Mobile, Ground-Based Platform Security System Which Transmits Images That Were Taken Prior To The Generation Of An Input Signal.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Son M. Tang** whose telephone number is (703) 306-5970. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Fri. from 7:30a.m. to 5:00p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Jeffery Hofsass**, can be reached on (703) 305-4717.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

8. **Any response to this action should be mailed to :**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231


or faxed to:

(703)872-9314 (note: for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Son Tang

November 17, 2001


JEFFERY HOFSSASS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600